

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

WALID ABDULLAH MUHAMMAD,

Petitioner,

v.

BERNADETTE MASON, Sup't SCI Mahanoy,  
and ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE  
STATE OF DELAWARE,

Respondents.

---

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

C.A. No. 24-683-GBW

**MEMORANDUM**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Petitioner is an inmate at SCI Mahanoy in Frackville, Pennsylvania. He has filed papers titled “Petition Under Habeas Corpus 28 U.S.C. For Writ 2254.” (D.I. 1 at 1) The papers do not challenge any specific conviction. Instead, Petitioner identifies an individual in Delaware, and asserts that she is an “unlawful restraint supplant surreptitious rigged for dishonest means freemasonry clandestine secrecy for evil and illicit unauthorized purposes black magic and white magic freemasonry accomplice.” (*Id.*)

## **II. DISCUSSION**

A district court may entertain a petition for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of someone in custody pursuant to the judgment of a state court only on the ground that his custody violates the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.

*See* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a); *Estelle v. McGuire*, 502 U.S. 62, 67-68 (1991). Rule 2(c) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases provides that the petition must

“specify all the grounds for relief” and “state the facts supporting each ground.”

Rule 2(c)(1), (2), 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254. A district court has the authority to

summarily dismiss a habeas petition “if it plainly appears from the face of the

petition and any exhibits annexed to it that the petitioner is not entitled to relief.”

Rule 4, 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254; *see McFarland v. Scott*, 512 U.S. 849, 856 (1994).

Petitioner does not identify the state criminal proceeding for which he is incarcerated and, more significantly, it does not appear that Petitioner is challenging a conviction entered in a Delaware state court. These deficiencies in Petitioner’s pleadings provide a sufficient basis for summary dismissal.

## **III. CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, the Court will summarily dismiss Petitioner’s § 2254 Petition. The Court will also decline to issue a certificate of appealability because Petitioner has failed to make a “substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.”

28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); 3d Cir. L.A.R. 22.2 (2011); *United States v. Eyer*, 113 F.3d 470 (3d Cir. 1997). A separate Order follows.

Dated: June 25, 2024



---

GREGORY B. WILLIAMS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE